A KKK Postcript to The Rosenberg Case, See Page 4

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 24 JULY 4, 1953 5 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

How Long Is The U.S. to Be Rhee's Satellite?

The Communist rejection of that incredible letter from General Mark Clark makes sense. It makes sense from every point of view, whether that of world peace, Chinese "face" or American dignity. To try a truce with Syngman Rhee uncommitted (he ought to be put away) is to invite provocations that might easily ignite World War III. The fighting now is at least limited to Korea but were a truce to be broken by Rhee it would be easy in the confusion to represent it as enemy treachery and thus give their head at last to those MacArthurite forces who have been longing for full-scale war with China.

The United States has been put in a most humiliating position by Rhee. The great Power which aspires to lead a "liberation" crusade against the Soviet third of the world has shown itself impotent to control and remodel tiny South Korea. Graver humiliations would be risked were a truce to be made with Rhee still in control of the South Korean police and army. What if he carried out his threat and refused to let neutral commissioners from India into the country? The question seems much less fantastic after the events of the past few weeks.

What is the answer? The answer ostensibly has been in General Clark's hands for several weeks. He has been given power to declare martial law in South Korea. If Washington had half the backbone shown by the crusty old tyrant in Seoul it would order Clark to put martial law into effect at once. The most important single political and moral act which could be performed by the "unified command" would be to use force to free Chough Pyung Ok from "protective custody". It is shocking that under the noses of our troops a member of the Korean National Assembly, leader of a major opposition party, should be beaten and imprisoned for saying in South Korea exactly what Eisenhower has been trying to say from Washington! Chough's crime was that he criticized Rhee for releasing POW's without consulting General Clark and declared Rhee's threat to go it alone would be national suicide.

This is supposed to be a war to make South Korea safe for democracy. The situation is made downright ludicrous when a political leader there dare not even voice a pro-American line! We have become Rhee's satellite when it is he who can call the tune of policy at home and abroad. The time has come when we must either do Rhee's bidding, which means to move closer to World War III, or oust him as head of South Korea. The task is not as formidable as it looks if one remembers that Rhee overwhelmingly lost the election held on the eve of the Korean war, and that he had to use martial law himself last year to force the South Korean Assembly to change the Constitution and make his reelection as President possible. His real strength is not to be measured by noisy demonstrations or by the Fascistic "youth groups" on which he has depended to terrorize the opposition.

A combination of military and political measures is necessary if more Americans are not to die in Korea and perhaps many many more in China. Military measures are required to show that we mean business and that advocates of peace may speak up in South Korea without fear. To end Rhee's scarcely veiled dictatorship would make it possible to win the support of the National Assembly. The great mass of the Korean people on both sides must be sick to death of a war that has made their tiny country a bloody training ground for the armies and air forces of the great Powers. If we believe in democracy, let us make it possible for the Korean people to speak. Under such conditions a program calling for unification of Korea and free elections under UN auspices to pick a new unified government would make sense as the political basis for a permanent peace. Any other kind of patched up truce would merely be a short breathing spell until we were summoned again to put out fires ignited by Rhee.

It is important at this juncture to remember that Rhee—for all his talk of unifying his country—was one of the few leaders who pressed originally for establishment of a separate State in South Korea despite Australian and Canadian misgivings and the opposition of most Korean political leaders right or left. They foresaw that separate elections would lead to civil war. It is also important to remember that Rhee has always opposed unification and free elections. His program has been for us to conquer North Korea by force and then hand over control of it to Rhee. Like Adenauer in that other Korea on the other side of Eurasia, Rhee has always feared that free elections in a unified country would be the end of his regime.

We have been paying with the blood of our sons for our political errors in Korea. We treated the Koreans all through World War II as an inferior breed, refusing them arms and the basis for a postwar government. After the war, MacArthur was consistently pro-Japanese in dealing with Korean problems. In the Korean occupation, we fumed but acquiesced in Rhee's high-handedness and in the terror and assassinations with which he liquidated opposition. After the war began, our troops treated as "gooks" the people we had come supposedly to liberate. Now we permit Rhee to beat and imprison those who dare speak up for peace. The contempt they must feel for us is easy to imagine, yet these are the people we must mobilize for peace if we are ever to disengage ourselves from an endless and futile war.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Paradoxical Picture in The Search for Peace

The nightmare had come to pass. There was a General in the White House and a General Motors executive in the Pentagon. By all the stereotypes cherished left of center, the General in the White House should have meant more power for the military and the GM executive in the Pentagon more arms orders for big business. Eisenhower and Wilson between them should have been producing the biggest arms budget in peacetime history. The paradox is that last week they were engaged in a major struggle against the military bureaucracy to put the brakes on armament spending. The Republican "party of big business" had supported them in two showdown votes, while ex-President Truman had emerged from a brief retirement to lead the Democratic "party of the little man" into battle on behalf of the military and aviation lobbies. This was the weird story unfolding in Washington.

The House had voted 234-108 to uphold Eisenhower's storm-provoking Reorganization Plan No. 6. Only 11 Republicans voted against the President and only a minority of Democrats had voted for him. The issue was obscure, and had been made more so by the sudden outcry that Eisenhower was trying to create a "Prussian-style" General Staff. Former President Hoover lined up against Eisenhower. David Lawrence denounced the plan daily. Clare Hoffman of Michigan, chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, tried his best to kill the plan. On the surface all it seemed to do was carry unification of the armed forces a few small steps further. It was calculated to increase the power of the Secretary of Defense and under him of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to weld three jealous and competing armed services a little more closely into a team.

The real issue was evident in the fear expressed by former Secretary of the Air Force, Thomas K. Finletter. "This move toward a centralized authority in a single department," Finletter told Clare Hoffman's committee, "is going to hit air power—hurt air power . . . Reorganization Plan No. 6 . . . will interfere with the proper presentation of the case of airpower."

Finletter said "We are indeed at this moment seeing an example in the debate over the budget for the fiscal year 1954 of the failure to provide the proper mechanism for the presentation of the air-atomic point of view." The day the Reorganization Plan was approved in the House, the aviation lobby suffered another defeat at the hands of the Administration and the Republican party. The powerful Appropriations Committee of the House not only rejected Air Force protest against a 5 billion dollar cut by Eisenhower and Wilson in the 1954 aviation budget but added another quarter billion dollar reduction on its own.

The Republicans are thinking in terms of "economy" —and driving hard for a tax cut in time for the next Congressional elections. The Democrats are still thinking of armament and war as a kind of gigantic "boondoggle"—they hope to pick up votes as a shrinking arms budget reduces jobs. In this picture the military are lined up with the Democrats—and so is labor. Armament has become a kind of pork barrel, as rivers and harbor legislation used to be, and every cut in an arms contract mobilizes local members of Congress and Senators with the labor unions and the aggrieved contractor for reinstatement. At Willow Run outside Detroit last week workers continued at work on cancelled Air Force contracts for overpriced C-119's and S-123's. A petition was circulated offering to work 30 days without pay to help Henry Kaiser get new business while Michigan's Senators, Ferguson and Potter, and Congressman George Meader put pressure on Secretary of Air Talbott to provide a new "fixed price" aircraft contract for Willow Run.

There was a revealing bit of dialogue on the Senate floor last week when Symington of Missouri, a Democrat, chief spokesman of the air lobby, used his maiden speech for a bitter attack on the cuts in the air force program. Senator Kerr, Democrat, of Oklahoma, put a question which disclosed an attitude of mind typical on the Democratic side:

> MR. KERR. Is there not abundant evidence of the fact that the hard-dollar policy of the administration was more influential in the decision made by the Secretary of Defense than an appropriate understanding of the necessities for the Nation's defense?
>
> MR. SYMINGTON. I believe the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is entirely correct.

Hatred of the "hard dollar" has been a characteristic of the popular party in this country as far back as Shay's Rebellion; Beard's "Economic Interpretation" showed the part agrarian and debtor desire for cheap money played in the original battle over the Constitution. But cheap money policies which financed reform and improvements under Franklin D. Roosevelt had become the vehicle for perpetual alarm and arms spending under Truman. To read the ex-President's speech to the Reserve Officers' Association, always a sounding board for the military bureaucracy, was to see that he slipped naturally from arguing the need for greater armament into a quite different kind of attack on "economizers". "What did we hear in 1939 and 1940? Why, we heard that a few billion dollars more of Federal spending would wreck the economy" and then after Pearl Harbor "We forgot all about those alleged dangers of wrecking the economy. We spent nearly $350 billion on armaments and war. We increased the national debt 400 percent. And our economy, after all that, didn't show the slightest sign of being wrecked . . . our economy came out of the Second World War in good health and, basically, it got steadily healthier throughout the postwar period."

What did Truman mean by economic health? "Whether people who want to work can find jobs at decent wages—whether national production is going up—whether businesses are growing . . ." But was it economically healthy, was it safe, was it decent to keep an economy pumped up by war and fear of war? This was the easy and popular way out. "Too few of us," said another voice in this debate, "have a real conception of the substantial portion of our economic vitality that is siphoned away as a result of our past approach to military programs." The speaker was the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roger M. Kyes, before the U. S. Chamber of Commerce. The difference in approach is the difference in attitude of the two parties toward military spending. That difference is important for peace.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• *Editor and Publisher*, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, $5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, $6; England and Continental Europe, $10 by 1st class mail, $15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, $10 by first class mail, $20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

July 4, 1953 Vol. I, No. 24

COMMENT

Footnote on Book-Burning

What is currently being called McCarthyism is, of course, much older and has more respectable beginnings and backing. In the current uproar about "book-burning", it is useful to recall that stricter surveillance of librarians and libraries was among the measures advocated by the U. S. Chamber of Commerce in the series of annual pamphlets it has issued since the war on community action against Communism. These pamphlets—to which I first called attention in the New York *Daily Compass*—blueprinted the drive toward thought control in America.

The 1948 pamphlet, "A Program for Community Anti-Communist Action", called for the extension of loyalty purge standards to all professions dealing with opinion. It mentioned teachers and it said "Librarians likewise are not beyond public scrutiny." The U. S. Chamber of Commerce said, "In spite of some highly publicized protests against 'censorship', it must be remembered that a public library is a public trust. It should not be used as a vehicle for publicizing Communist propaganda."

If libraries are not to be a "vehicle for Communist propaganda", somebody must decide what books are Communist propaganda and whether they should be allowed in the library. This is censorship. The Chamber of Commerce said cautiously that it did not mean "we should protest because a library carries the works of Marx, Lenin, Stalin. But we should be concerned when (1) The amount of Communist or pro-Communist literature is out of proportion to factual anti-Communist literature and (2) pro-Communist studies are promoted in library literature as objective or recommended studies." This means encouraging busy-bodies to snoop around libraries for what they may consider pro-Communist books.

That program five years ago already outlined a drive to "purge" the book reviews as well as the libraries, foreshadowing that lengthy analysis of literary reviews by the McCarran committee in its search last year for books and reviewers critical of American Far Eastern policy and of Chiang Kai-shek. "The real danger in this field," the U. S. Chamber of Commerce said in 1948, "is not usually the attitude of the librarians themselves. It is the fact that many of their important book review sources are infiltrated by Communists or sympathizers."

Thought Control and Labor

In the same pattern is the drive to subject the labor movement to the Subversive Activities Control Board. This has long been the goal of the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, both of which supported the McCarran Act under which that Board was established. The Goldwater-Rhodes bill, which would have given the Board sweeping powers over labor unions, bogged down in unfavorable publicity. But the Jenner committee was off on a new tack last week-end with the announcement that hearings would soon be held by a special "task force of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee" on a similar measure by Senator Butler, R., of Maryland, McCarthy's protege in his successful fight against Tydings.

The "task force" has been nicely chosen for this task. Butler, Welker and McCarran will make up the subcommittee and several weeks of hearings will be held this month. Butler's bill would enable the Subversive Activities Control Board to put out of business any union it regarded as subversive. McCarran has a bill to bar "subversives" from labor unions and allow employers to fire them at will. It remains to be seen whether the labor movement can rise above its own intra-mural feuds and obsessions to see the danger in such legislation to all militant trade unionism.

Giddy Air Force

A chart on page 281 of the House Appropriations Committee hearings on the Air Force shows the giddy way arms budgets are made up and billions juggled. Originally the Air Force asked 22 billions for fiscal 1954. The Department of Defense staff experts cut this to 15 and a half billions. The Air Force came back with a revised estimate of 19 and a half billions. The Department of Defense in submitting final estimates to the Budget Bureau split the difference and asked for 17 billions. The Budget Bureau cut this down by one billion and Truman put it up a half billion in the estimates he sent Congress last January. This 16 billion dollar figure was cut three and three quarter billions by Eisenhower and Wilson. The House Appropriations Committee cut another quarter billion off the total last week, recommending 11 billions or just one half the original Air Force request.

143 Wings and Garrison State

The figures show a growing gap between the amounts appropriated for the Air Force and the amounts spent. The carry-over at the end of this year, according to Senator Ferguson will be 28 billions. The House Appropriations Committee pointed out that even with the cuts it recommended the Air Force—thanks to the carry-over—would have more than 36 billions to spend in the fiscal year beginning this week. Flanders of Vermont went to the point when he told the Senate after Symington's attack on Air Force budget reductions, "It has been very evident that we have appropriated beyond our ability to build without going on a wartime basis."

Dulles on East-West Trade

Official responsibility and economic reality have had their sobering influence on John Foster Dulles, at least in respect to East-West trade in Europe. The recently released Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on the Mutual Security Act of 1953 disclose an unexpected moderation on the part of the Secretary of State when he was asked about East-West trade by Senator Smith, R., of N. J.

Secretary Dulles said East-West trade in Europe now amounted to about $800,000,000 "a year both ways, and it is our present thinking at least that it would not be desirable to try to cut that trade off. It would impose upon us a very heavy additional responsibility . . . It would either mean a very sharp decline in the economic conditions in those countries or we would have to compensate by increased aid from ourselves."

"And furthermore," Dulles went on, sounding quite unlike himself, "I believe that kind of trade can be definitely to our advantage in particularly awakening the satellite countries to the possibilities of closer relations with the Western countries as what they can get through their present relations with the Soviet Union."

The Secretary of State as an example told the Senators he had spoken with the U. S. Ambassador to Hungary "and he said that there was a very great desire on the part of Hungary to have closer relations with the West of an economic character and to lose even its economic dependence upon the Soviet Union." Under the circumstances Dulles thought it would be unwise "to cut off that trade", except for the Battle Act restrictions on strategic materials.

> Senator SMITH. Some of us, of course, are bothered by the thought that almost any article today is of some strategic value.
>
> Secretary DULLES. Yes, that is quite true, but by the same token you might say what we get from them is of strategic value to us.

The idea expressed is that trade is mutually beneficial. The idea was no longer novel in the days of Homer. But its rediscovery in cold war Washington is news.

7 ★

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Bright Postcript by the Ku Klux Klan

The day after my friend and neighbor Fyke Farmer returned from Washington, two days after the sentence of the court in *The People vs. Julius and Ethel Rosenberg* had been executed, I was his guest for dinner at his home. Afterward, as the evening darkened and cooled, we sat in his sun porch and he spoke of the piece he was thinking of writing, "Why I Believe the Rosenbergs Were Innocent." "Who would publish it?" he said. I mentioned Life . . . "After all, the Pope was interested." He was called to the phone and I sat with Mrs. Farmer. She is a quiet woman with graying hair; her strong face makes you think of the Pioneers. She had a kitten on her lap. There was a little brown dog in the porch. We talked of their pets, of their children who were at summer camps. Fyke came back grinning. "John Beverly; we were at Vanderbilt together." Beverly had called to tell him that friends at his house were saying Farmer must be a Communist. "He called to tell me he had 'stood up for me,'" Fyke said. "They'd had a drink or two around." The little brown dog was behaving nervously. Mrs. Farmer went to the door and let him out.

What had led him to believe they were innocent was the record; they had told a "straight story" all the way through. Greenglass' testimony was given "under duress, his life was at stake." Under the same duress the others would not change their story to save their lives. "They could have *invented* something . . ." Outside, the dog was barking so excitedly I could not hear the rest of his sentence. A plane was going over, the 10 o'clock transcontinental, westbound. With a murmur of exasperation Mrs. Farmer let the dog in.

She took him away to another part of the house, and we heard her cry "There's a fire." I glanced over my shoulder. There was indeed a small, lively blaze down at the foot of the lawn, under the trees. Someone burning leaves . . . But then, at the front door, she cried more sharply, and Fyke and I went out to the veranda.

In the still black night, the cross was flaming silently. It was about eight feet tall, at the side of the street. Fyke went down the steps and halfway across the lawn and came back to the house. "Perhaps I should call the police, or the sheriff. Would you call the police or the sheriff? Or the paper?" "If anybody," I said, "I'd call the fire department." We returned to our chairs in the sun porch. The light from the blazing cross flickered on the windows. A boy's voice called at the door: "It was three young fellows in a big car, Mr. Farmer. A black car." Fyke thanked him. He handed me some manuscript sheets. "I've just started writing it," he said. "I want to see Justice Frankfurter's dissent first." His wife stroked the white kitten in her lap. She said nothing but I noticed that she could not help glancing up at any noise in the street.

A car grated in the drive; a reporter and a photographer knocked at the door at the end of the porch. "We got a call about a cross burning out here, Mr. Farmer." Mrs. Farmer said softly, "I think I know who called." The blaze was about out.

"In Tampa, when Al Smith was running," I told Mrs. Farmer, "the Kluxers came into town and burnt crosses in the cigar-making section. It was midnight. When they drove out Seventh Avenue in Ybor City, the Cubans stood on boxes and yelled at them 'Viva Al Smeet!'" She smiled, but very faintly. I do not think she was alarmed, but this was her home. She said, "I don't want any more publicity." Fyke heard her, and told the reporter and the photographer, "No pictures. That's the story. Thanks." They went away.

"Do you know what he asked me?" Fyke said. "Whether I'd been in Washington. Where were we?" Mrs. Farmer brought us mint tea and sat down again and stroked the kitten. Their house is on a shaded street where the houses are far apart. Occasionally there was voices in the street and Mrs. Farmer lifted her head at these sounds. Their high school son came in and put up the car and passed, whistling, through the house toward the kitchen. They said nothing to him of the incident.

"Do you sometimes wonder," Fyke said suddenly, "whether in the end we'll be able to keep our democracy?" I tried to reassure him. "I'm pretty sure it's been a fight since the beginning. A good fight." I thought they would feel better in the morning. When I drove out of their gate, not a spark of the hate-stick remained.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 7-4-53
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. $5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....

State .....

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED